Received from < > at 7/3/03 12:24:18 PM [Eastern Daylight Time]

USSN. 09/742,560 Examiner: YIP, WINNIE S Group A.U.: 3637

July 3, 2003

Remarks

It is observed that the Examiner rejected claims 20-23, 25-27, 34-41, 43, 50, 52-57,

64, 66 as being anticipated by EP 381,000.

The Examiner also rejected claims 22, 24-25, 38, 41-42, 53 and 56 for formal

reasons, as well as claims 20-37 and 65.

The Examiner indicated that claims 51 and 65 would be allowable if rewritten in

independent form.

Accordingly, the applicant has cancelled claims 1-37, 51 and 65 and has amended

claims 38, 53 and 56.

The amended independent claim 38 now contains all of the features of previous

dependent claim 51 and amended independent claim 53 contains all of the features

of previous dependent claim 65.

As far as the Examiner objection to the term "plastic deformation" with regard to a

metal profiled element, it is submitted that "plastic deformation" does not mean

that the material is made of "plastics", but simply that the material is plastically

deformed due to its plasticity, a feature that indicates the behaviour of a material.

In particular, also a metal may have plasticity as one of its features.

As to the objections to the drawings, the applicant respectfully observes that the no

criticality is seen in embedding the claimed profiled element in a concrete panel.

However, a new schematic drawing is herewith enclosed which illustrates a

concrete panel with the profiles embedded.

Please note that no new matter has been introduced since the drawing only

illustrates what was already disclosed in the specification and since, as said, the

Received from < > at 7.13/03 12:24:18 PM [Eastern Daylight Time]

USSN. 09/742,560

Examiner: YIP, WINNIE S Group A.U.: 3637

July 3, 2003

embedding of the profiles does not present any particular problem that the skilled man in the art would be faced with.

The application is now believed to be in order for acceptance and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

While it is believed that the amended claims properly define the present invention and distinguish the same over the art of record, applicant would be open to any suggestion the Examiner may have concerning different claim phraseology which, in the Examiner's opinion, more accurately defines the present invention.

Respectfully submitted,

Guido MODIANO (Reg. No. 19,928)

Agent for the Applicant

Via Meravigli 16

20123 MILAN-ITALY

Tel. +39 02 8590.7777

Milan: July 3, 2003

Encl.: Figures 1-11 and new Fig. 12.